(iii) Sanctioned credit limits of Rs. 1999.69 crores to State Cooperative Banks;

(iv) Sanctioned Credit limits of Rs. 307.59 crores to Regional Rural Banks.

NABARD has decided that the banks shall not charge penal interest on individual agricultural loans upto Rs. 25,000/-borrowed during each of the three or more years of consecutive drought/flood ending with 1987-88.

The Statewise break-up of the disbursements/sanctions of finance from NABARD | for the year 1987-1988 is given at *An-\ nexure \See* Appendix IV, Annexure No. 124.

A further statement showing state-wise projected and annual disbursements limits sanctioned to State Cooperative Banks, Regional Rural Banks and State Governments during 1988-89 is given at *Annexure [See* Appendix CLV, Annexure No. 125].

Appointment of shipping Development fund Committee by SCICI

3455. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Shipping Credit Investment Company of India Ltd. (SCICI) have appointed designated person for erstwhile Shipping Development Fund Committee;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the Shipping Development Fund Committee disbursed loans for shipping companies and also for Deep Sea fishing companies;

(c) if so, since when SCICI have started acting as designated person for Shipping Development Fund Comittee;

(d) what is the amount outstanding as on date towards principal and interest for shipping companies and deep sea fishing companies, separately;

(e) what is the amount granted as waiver or by way of writing off loans and interest for fishing and shipping companies separately; and

(f) what are the names of such companies and details thereof ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI) : (a) Shipping Credit & Investment Company of India Limited (SCICI) is the designated person of the Central Government appointed pursuant to the provisions of the Shipping Development Fund Committee (Abolition) Act, 1986 to monitor the affairs of the erstwhile Shipping Development Fund Committee (SDFC).

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) with effect from April 3, 1987.

(d) The amount outstanding towards Principal and Interest as on June 30, 1990 in respect of shipping and deep-sea fishing companies assisted by erstwhile SDFC is as follows :—

(Rs. in Crores)

	Principal	Interest	Total
Shipping Companies Deep-sea	740.22	120.62	860.84
fishing Companies .	86.40	18.38	104.78

(e) There has been on waiver or writing off of loans and interest for shipping and deep-sea fishing companies in respect of the loans availed by them from the erstwhile Shipping Development Fund Committee (SDFC).

(f) The question does not arise.

Cases filed against Management of State Bank of India, Regional Office, Meerut (U.P.)

3456. SHRI ISH DUTT YADAV : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that a number of employees had filed a number of cases against the management of the State Bank of India, Regional Office, Meerut (U.P.) with the Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, New Delhi during 1985 for their wrongful removal from service;

(b) whether it is also a fact that in this order dated 23-2-87 (I.D. 38/85) the Labour Court had decided in favour of some SC/ST employees;

(c) whether it is also a fact that these | SC/ST employees have not so far been reinstated in their services by the State i Bank of India, Regional Office, Meerut! despite the order in their favour; and

(d) if so, what are the reasons therefor | and what steps have been taken by Government for the reinstatement for these employees ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE) MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL; SHASTRI) : (a) to (d) The SBI have reported that only one employee belonging | to SC community had filed a case against I the management of the SBI Zonal Office, Meerut with the Presiding Officer, Central Governmnent Industrial Tribunal-cum Labour Court, New Delhi during 1985. The person is reported to be involved in a case of misappropriation. The Tribunal had held the Bank's action in discharging him as non-maintainable. The SBI is, however, of the view that the award of the Tribunal is erroneous. The Bank has since obtained a stay against the operation of the Award from the High Court of I Delhi. The matter is, therefore, subjudice.

Celling on Government Borrowings

3457. SHRI SURESH PACHOURI : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether he has suggested that a ceiling be imposed on Government borrowings, both internal and external, under Article 292 of the Constitution;

(b) if so, what are the main reasons therefor; and

(c) by when a final decision in the matter is likely to be taken ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI) : (a) to (c) To curb the growth of internal and external debt one of the suggestions was to have a ceiling imposed through a law under article 292 of the Constitution. The pros and cons of this suggestion are still under consideration of Government.

Import of DMT Plant by M/s. Bombay Dyeing

3458. SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA : Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether Bombay Dyeing had negotiated the import of DMT plant of 60,000 tonnes capacity at about $ 9 million;

(b) whether it is a fact that the ICICI, the financing agency for the second plant, had actually remitted $ 10 million between the years 1982-85 to the suppliers
of the plant, bearing a balance of $ 1 million in foreign exchange for the company; and

(c) if so, what action Government have taken against the company for violation of the FERA provisions ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ANIL SHASTRI) : (a) and (b) M/s. Bombay Dyeing Mfg. Co. Ltd., imported a second hand DMT plant of 60,000 tonnes capacity from U.S.A. The cost of the base plant at $ 10 million was paid through ICICI and SBI in terms of Bridge loan but certain residual items valued at $ 8,86,941 were not brought into India.

(c) Adjudication proceedings have been initiated against the company and Shri Nusli Wadia by issue of a Show Cause Notice on 18-5-90 for violation of the provisions of Sections 8(3) and 8(4) of the F.E.R. Act, 1973, to the extent of U.S. $ 8,86,941.